

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

Steven McElrath,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	Civil Action No.: 5:17-01569-JMC
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Warden, McCormick Correctional Institution,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

Petitioner, proceeding *pro se*, brought this action seeking relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter is before the court for review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) (ECF No. 31), filed February 16, 2018. The Report recommends that the court should dismiss Petitioner’s Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 29) for lack of timeliness with no entitlement to equitable tolling of the statute of limitation and the court should also grant Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 22).

The Magistrate Judge’s Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c) for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the court, which has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court reviews *de novo* only those portions of a Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation to which specific objections are filed and reviews for clear error those portions to which there are no objections. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005); *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983); *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report (ECF No. 31-1), and neither party has filed any objections.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis* at 199. "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court . . . must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.' " *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.* at 315 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court finds the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law and does not contain clear error. The court **ACCEPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 31). Therefore, the court **DISMISSES** Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 29) for lack of timeliness with no entitlement to equitable tolling of the statute of limitation and **GRANTS** Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 22).

#### Certificate of Appealability

The law governing certificates of appealability provides that:

(c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(c)(3) The certificate of appealability . . . shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28. U.S.C § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*,

537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J. Michelle Childs". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

United States District Judge

May 21, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina